REMARKS

Claims 1 through 5 and 7 though 27 are in the application, with claims 1 through 5, 7, 8, 10 though 18, 20 through 23, and 25 through 27 having been amended, and claim 6 having been cancelled. Claims 1, 13, 18, and 23 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 10 through 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,834,310 ("Munger"). Claims 3 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Munger in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0058860 ("Kunze"). Claims 18 – 20 and 23 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Munger in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,878,002 ("Heatzig"). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 13, 18, and 23

Amended independent claim 1 discloses a method comprising identifying a first portion of an IP address and a second portion of the IP address, storing the first portion and the second portion, checking if the first portion has a first pre-determined relationship to a plurality of stored patterns associated with the first portion, checking if the second portion has a second pre-determined relationship to a second stored pattern associated with the second portion, and generating an indication that the information packet has an invalid IP Address if either the first portion check or the second portion check fails. Moreover, the IP address is contained in a packet header for an information packet.

The art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest the above-mentioned features of amended independent claim 1. In particular, the art of record cannot be seen to disclose or suggest identifying a first portion of an IP address and a second portion of the IP address where the IP address is contained in a packet header for an information packet.

Munger, at column 22, discloses a receive table that lists IP addresses and destination IP addresses. Munger checks the receive table to determine if an IP is valid or invalid. However, nowhere does Munger disclose that a first portion of an IP address is checked nor does Munger disclose that a second portion of the IP address is checked. Furthermore, and referring to FIG. 9, Munger illustrates that the IP addresses listed are full IP addresses.

Accordingly, nowhere can Parker be seen to disclose or suggest identifying a first portion of an IP address and a second portion of the IP address where the IP address is contained in a packet header for an information packet. In view of the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 and its related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Amended independent claims 13, 18, and 23 roughly correspond to amended independent claim 1. Therefore, amended independent claims 3, 18, and 23 and their related dependent claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

C O N C L U S I O N

The outstanding Office Action presents a number of characterizations regarding the applied references, some of which are not directly addressed by this response. Applicants do not necessarily agree with the characterizations and reserve the right to further discuss those characterizations.

For at least the reasons given above, it is submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-4982.

Respectfully submitted,

August 24, 2007

Date

/Richard S. Finkelstein/

Richard S. Finkelstein
Registration No. 56,534
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-4982